UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/898,714	07/03/2001	Kim E. Belenger	82937	2453

7590 04/08/2004

Office Of Counsel, Bldg 112T
Naval Undersea Warfare Center
Division, Newport
1176 Howell Street
Newport, RI 02841-1708

EXAMINER	
WILSON, YOLANDA L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2113	2

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/898,714	Applicant(s) BELENGER ET AL.	
	Examiner Yolanda Wilson	Art Unit 2113	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 July 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1- 20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-10,12-18 and 20* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *4,11 and 19* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 4,11,19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3,5,16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stone (USPN 6523137B1) in view of Cunniff et al. (USPN 5842015A). As appears in claim 1, Stone discloses providing a computerized dialog to enable a user to create an input data file for said test object functional element, prompting a user for at least one functional element interface task which has been previously developed utilizing said stand-alone testing environment and which is of a form compliant with said predetermined interface protocol; starting said at least one functional interface task utilizing said computer dialog created input data file; and monitoring said plurality of interfaces in column 5, 15-43.

Stone fails to explicitly state the test object functional element being in a form to be subsequently stored in an identifiable location in said shared memory.

Cunniff et al. discloses in column 2, lines 57-60, "The shared memory buffer is an interprocess communication mechanism that enables high speed, real-time communication between multiple application programs and the daemon resource."

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the test object functional element being in a form to be subsequently stored in an identifiable location in said shared memory. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the test object functional element being in a form to be subsequently stored in an identifiable location in said shared memory because the test object functional element will be accessible by the application programs which will be using it.

Stone fails to explicitly state at least one functional element interface task being stored with its identifiable location in said shared memory.

Cunniff et al. discloses in column 2, lines 57-60, "The shared memory buffer is an interprocess communication mechanism that enables high speed, real-time communication between multiple application programs and the daemon resource."

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have at least one functional element interface task being stored with its identifiable location in said shared memory. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have at least one functional element interface task being stored with its identifiable location in said shared memory because the at least one functional element task will be accessible by the application programs which will be using it.

4. As per claim 2, Stone discloses starting a user supplied application system task along with said at least one functional interface task in column 5, lines 15-43.

5. As per claim 3, Stone discloses displaying a status window while running said at least one functional interface task in column 4, lines 39-42.

6. As per claim 5, Stone discloses storing a unique interface file corresponding to said at least one functional element interface task in column 5, lines 15-43.

7. As per claim 16, Stone discloses said interface communication protocol being a protocol for inter-process communication of an application interface task from said test object functional element to at least one other functional element which also forms a portion of said computer system; said plurality of interfaces including a subsystem for implementing said inter-process communication interface protocol in column 5, lines 15-43.

Stone fails to explicitly state comprising a memory operatively connected to said test object functional element and to said at least one other functional element by an arrangement whereby said functional elements share said memory; said subsystem for implementing the inter-process communication interface protocol employing a mode of operation in which data to be communicated through an interface is passed between functional elements by a process of notifying the functional element to which an application interface task is be communicated that data is ready and providing the addressed functional element with the location of the data in said shared memory.

Cunniff et al. discloses in column 2, lines 57-60, "The shared memory buffer is an interprocess communication mechanism that enables high speed, real-time communication between multiple application programs and the daemon resource."

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have said test object functional element and at least one other functional element share a memory and have data passed between the functional elements by notifying the functional element to which an application interface task is communicated that data is ready and providing the addressed functional element with the location of the data in said shared memory. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have said test object functional element and at least one other functional element share a memory and have data passed between the functional elements by notifying the functional element to which an application interface task is communicated that data is ready and providing the addressed functional element with the location of the data in said shared memory because the functional elements will have a common place to receive data from the application task requested of them.

8. Claim 6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stone (USPN 6523137B1) in view of Cunniff et al. (USPN 5842015A) in further view of Miles (USPN 6654911B1). As per claim 6, Stone discloses storing said input data file in a user defined file such that said user defined file may be viewed in column 5, lines 24-27. Stone and Cunniff fail to explicitly state said input data file is in a user defined file such that the user defined file can be edited outside of said stand alone testing environment.

Miles discloses in the abstract, "In one embodiment, the first and second instances of the first test case may be individually edited such that the first and second instances of the first test case have different parameter values."

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have said input data file is in a user defined file such that the user defined file can be edited outside of said stand alone testing environment. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have said input data file is in a user defined file such that the user defined file can be edited outside of said stand alone testing environment because changes may need to be made to the data file for testing purposes.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 7-10,12-15,17,18,20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stone. As per claim 7, Stone discloses creating an input data file for said test object functional element by prompting a user for data format and content compatible with said predetermined interface protocol; storing said input data file; creating a test generation file by providing said user with a plurality of task creation options whereby selected task creation options are input into said test generation file which is written in a predetermined high level interface programmers' language adapted for compilation into

computer code executable statements compatible with said predetermined protocol; compiling said test generation file and said input data file to produce a test case executable file in a preferred programming language based on said selected task creation options; initiating a test utilizing said test case executable file and said input data file for testing said test object functional element and said at least one interface by monitoring a status of said test; and storing test result data related to said test in column 5, lines 15-67; column 8, lines 10-20.

11. As per claim 8, Stone discloses said step of creating a test generation file further comprises selecting test initiation features column 5, lines 15-67.

12. As per claim 9, Stone discloses wherein said step of creating a test generation file further comprises providing for at least one user defined button column 5, lines 15-43.

13. As per claim 10, Stone discloses wherein said at least one user defined button is user operable for said step of initiating said test column 5, lines 15-43.

14. As per claim 12, displaying said input data to a user on a file viewer. It would be inherent when the application was developed for the input data to be seen by the user.

15. As per claim 13, Stone discloses comparing said test result data with expected results from said test object functional element utilizing said input data file in column 7, lines 16-64.

16. As per claim 14, Stone discloses a test case data file producing subsystem for facilitating the production by a user of at least one file of test case data, said test case data producing subsystem being operative for identification of an input data structure

and to utilize said input data structure to prompt a user for input values of said test case data, said test case data producing subsystem being operative to store said at least one file of test case data; a test case generation file producing subsystem for facilitating the production by said user of a test case generation file, said test case generation file producing subsystem providing a plurality of user interface task options to provide the user with a choice among them in developing a test case generation file of a selected at least one interface task of said plurality of interface tasks, said selected at least one interface task being for communication to said test object functional element through a first predetermined at least one communication interface; a test case execution subsystem to effect operation of said test object functional element based on said user selected at least one interface task and said at least one file of test case data, whereby said test case execution subsystem enables said user to test said test object functional element for validity and accuracy of its operation by monitoring a second predetermined at least one of the remaining communication of interfaces of said plurality of communication interfaces in column 5, lines 15-43.

17. As per claim 15, Stone discloses said input data structure is utilized to prompt a user for test case data being in a form cooperatively associated with said predetermined interface communication protocol to constrain said at least one test case data file to be compatible with said predetermined interface protocol; said plurality of user interface task options provided by said test case generation file producing subsystem being in form cooperatively associated with said predetermined interface communication protocol to constrain said selected at least one interface task to be written in a

predetermined high level interface programmers' language adapted for compilation into computer code executable statements compatible with said predetermined interface protocol; and said operation of said test object functional element effected by said test case execution subsystem comprising said operation of said test object functional element using a file of compiled executable statements based upon said test case data and said test case generation file in column 5, lines 15-43.

18. As per claim 17, Stone discloses said test case execution subsystem is operable to effect operation of another test object functional element simultaneously with operation of said test object functional element in column 5, lines 15-43.

19. As per claim 18, Stone discloses said test case execution subsystem is operable to monitor said at least one interface between said test object function element and said another test object functional element in column 5, lines 15-43.

20. As per claim 20, Stone discloses said test case generation file producing subsystem is operative to provide the user a choice among a plurality test initiation events to cause the test to be performed upon a selected test initiation event to start flow of said test case data into said first functional element column 5, lines 15-43.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yolanda Wilson whose telephone number is (703) 305-3298. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on (703) 305-9713. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ROBERT BEAUSOLIEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100